OPINION 2271 (Case 3481)

Crioceris quadripunctata Olivier, 1808 (currently Petauristes quadripunctatus; Insecta, Coleoptera): specific name conserved

Abstract. The Commission has conserved the name *Petauristes quadripunctatus* (Olivier, 1808) for a common and widespread South Asian beetle originally described as *Crioceris quadripunctata*, by ruling that it is not invalid by reason of being a junior primary homonym of *Crioceris quadripunctata* Fabricius, 1801 (currently *Monolepta quadripunctata*).

Keywords. Nomenclature; taxonomy; Insecta; Coleoptera; Chrysomelidae; *Petauristes*; *Petauristes quadripunctatus*; Southern Asia.

Ruling

- (1) Under the plenary power it is hereby ruled that the name quadripunctata Olivier, 1808, as published in the binomen Crioceris quadripunctata, is not invalid by reason of being a junior primary homonym of quadripunctata Fabricius, 1801, as published in the binomen Crioceris quadripunctata.
- (2) The following names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology:
 - (a) quadripunctata Fabricius, 1801, as published in the binomen Crioceris quadripunctata;
 - (b) quadripunctata Olivier, 1808, as published in the binomen Crioceris quadripunctata, with the endorsement that it is not invalid by reason of being a junior primary homonym of quadripunctata Fabricius, 1801, as published in the binomen Crioceris quadripunctata, as ruled in (1) above.

History of Case 3481

An application to conserve the use of the name *Petauristes quadripunctatus* (Olivier, 1808) for a common and widespread South Asian beetle originally described as *Crioceris quadripunctata*, and thus a junior primary homonym of *Crioceris quadripunctata* Fabricius, 1801 (currently *Monolepta quadripunctata*), was received from Hans Silfverberg (*Finnish Museum of Natural History, Zoological Museum, Helsinki University, Helsinki, Finland*) on 24 October 2008. After correspondence the case was published in BZN 66: 317–319 (December 2009). The title, abstract and keywords of the case were published on the Commission's website. No comments were received on this case.

Decision of the Commission

On 1 December 2010 the members of the Commission were invited to vote on the proposals published in BZN 66: 318. At the close of the voting period on 1 March 2011 the votes were as follows:

Affirmative votes – 23: Ballerio, Bogutskaya, Bouchet, Brothers, Fautin, Grygier, Halliday, Harvey, Kojima, Kottelat, Krell, Kullander, Lim, Minelli, Pape, Papp, Patterson, Rosenberg, Štys, van Tol, Winston, Yanega and Zhou.

Negative votes – 2: Lamas and Zhang.

Alonso-Zarazaga, Ng and Pyle were on leave of absence.

Voting FOR, Harvey commented that, although he felt the case was relatively straightforward and he supported the application to maintain existing usage of the junior homonym, he advised that details of any existing type specimens of both *Crioceris quadripunctata* Fabricius, 1801 and *Crioceris quadripunctata* Olivier, 1808 should be supplied to verify current taxonomic placements. Also voting FOR, Kottelat said that the application referred to Article 23.9.5, which says that 'the case *should* be referred to the Commission' in the English version of the Code. However, the French version says that '[the author] *may* submit the case to the Commission', which has different implications.

Original references

The following are the original references to the names placed on Official Lists by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

quadripunctata, Crioceris, Fabricius, 1801, Systema Eleutheratorum. Tomus II. Kiliae, p. 460. quadripunctata, Crioceris, Olivier, 1808, Entomologie, ou Histoire Naturelle des Insectes. Coléoptères. Tome sixième, Paris, Chez Desray, p. 731.